

04. *PPH*
Library

U. S. NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH ACTIVITY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92152

RESEARCH REPORT SRR 66-7

NOVEMBER 1965

AD0624142

THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTING EARLY FITNESS REPORTS FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

William H. Githens
Bernard Rimland
John H. Steinemann

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED



20050718044

AN ACTIVITY OF THE BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTING EARLY FITNESS REPORTS
FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

by

William H. Githens
Bernard Rimland
John H. Steinemann

November 1965

PF016060101
Research Report SRR 66-7

Submitted by

B. Rimland, Ph.D., Director, Personnel Measurement Research Department

Approved by

E. E. Dudek, Ph.D., Technical Director
G. W. Watson, Commander, USN
Officer in Charge

Distribution of this document is unlimited

U. S. Naval Personnel Research Activity
San Diego, California 92152

BRIEF

The major purpose of this investigation was to determine the need for making statistical corrections to the fitness reports of junior officers to adjust for possible inequalities due to extraneous situational factors. The situational influences for which corrections were made were (a) type of duty stations at which reports were made, (b) number of reports (up to 5) the officer had received, (c) rater familiarity with the junior officer, as measured by the number of successive reports completed by the same rater.

The analysis was conducted on the reports received during the first 18 months of active duty of 1,338 members of the NROTC graduating Class of 1959. The sample was fractionated into groups homogeneous with regard to the variables being studied. Standard scores were computed for each subgroup, and these were compared with raw, unstandardized average fitness scores for the total group.

Although significant differences in fitness ratings were attributable to factors (a) and (b) above, a correlation of .97 was found between the standardized (corrected) scores and the raw, unstandardized scores, thus indicating the influence of the variables corrected for to be practically negligible. An additional finding was that correlations of about .90 among the four scales on the Fitness Report Summary Sheet permit these four scales to be averaged without significant loss of information.

Although conducted in the process of developing a means for using early fitness reports as a research criterion, the findings of this study are encouraging in that they suggest the fitness report to be relatively uninfluenced by extraneous factors as used operationally.

CONTENTS

	Page
Brief	iii
A. PURPOSE	1
B. POPULATION	1
C. DATA.	1
D. PROCEDURE	
1. Report Number	2
2. Rater Familiarity	2
3. Type of Duty Station	2
4. Actual Performance Rating	2
E. RESULTS	
1. Means	4
2. Intercorrelations	7
F. DISCUSSION	
1. Station Differences	7
2. Rater Familiarity	9
3. Rating Number	9
4. Use of a Single Summary Score to Reflect an Officer's Cumulated Fitness Marks	9
5. Standardization of Scores	10
G. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
REFERENCES.	11
APPENDIX A -- Worksheet	12

TABLES

	Page
1. Rating Means, Standard Deviations and <u>N</u> 's for Groups By Type of Duty Station on First Fitness Report	5
2. Significance Levels of Differences Between Duty Stations In Mean Ratings on First Fitness Report	5
3. Fitness Scale "a" (Present Assignment) Means, Standard Deviations, and <u>N</u> 's for Groups by Report Number, Duty Station, and Number of Reports by Same Rater	6
4. Intercorrelations of Raw and Standardized Fitness Report Scores	8

THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTING EARLY FITNESS REPORTS FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

A. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if corrections are needed to compensate for the degree to which certain extraneous factors influence fitness report marks. Examples of such extraneous factors are: number of fitness reports received, number of fitness reports received from the same rater, and type of duty station at which ratings were received. Should the effects of these extraneous factors be found to be significant, they should be appropriately compensated for when fitness marks are being used operationally in making administrative decisions concerning naval officers.

The development of a single summary type score to reflect fitness marks in general is a secondary purpose of this study. A single score to represent an overall evaluation of an officer's performance is frequently needed.

B. POPULATION

The population of this study consists of the 1,338 graduates of these NROTC programs who were commissioned as Ensigns during the calendar year 1959. Of these there were 804 Regular and 534 Contract students.

C. DATA

An Officer Summary Record (NAVPERS 1269 Rev. 7-57) was obtained for each officer in the population. These records include the following information abstracted from each fitness report completed for the officer during his first 18-month period of active service:¹

Location and type of duty

Name of reporting senior

Rank of reporting senior

Rating score for Item 14a, "Present assignment"

¹The fitness form used during this investigation was NAVPERS 310 Rev. 3-54 "Report on the Fitness of Officers," a copy of which is shown in Appendix A.

Rating score for Item 15, "Considering the possible requirements of war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command"

Rating score for Item 16a, "In comparison with other officers of his grade and approximate length of service, how would you designate this officer?"

Rating score for Item 19, a summary score giving equal weight to the following six qualities: "Professional knowledge, cooperation, judgement, leadership, promotion potential, and management effectiveness"

D. PROCEDURE

The above fitness report information contained in the Officer Summary Record for each officer was coded as follows:

1. Report Number

The fitness reports received by each officer were assigned a chronological number; the first report received was assigned a one, the second a two, etc., to a maximum total of five reports. Many officers in the sample had less than five fitness reports available.

2. Rater Familiarity

The first fitness report submitted on a particular officer by a reporting senior was assigned a one, the second by the same rater was assigned a two, etc.

3. Type of Duty Station

After discussion with a number of officers, the following scheme for categorizing duty types was selected as being most consonant with the purposes of this investigation:

- A. Large Combat Vessel
- B. Small Combat Vessel
- C. Non-Combat Vessel
- D. Shore Duty in U.S.
- E. Shore Duty Outside U.S.
- F. Duty Under Instruction

4. Actual Performance Ratings

These were the rating scores obtained from the fitness reports, see Appendix A:

- a. Present assignment (X_a) (Item 14a)
- b. Desirability (X_b) (Item 15)
- c. Comparison (X_c) (Item 16a)
- d. Quality (X_d) (Item 19)

The numerical weight for each scale value has been typewritten on the form in the appendix. The Quality Rating is represented by an average of all the sub-scales included as part of Item 19.

Since it was felt that the index derived should reflect actual on-the-job performance and not academic ability, reports completed while on "Duty under Instruction" were eliminated from the analysis.

Four scores were then computed as follows:

1. Average Raw Score. The average (across all fitness reports) for each of the four rating scores above were computed for each officer:

$$\bar{X}_a, \bar{X}_b, \bar{X}_c, \bar{X}_d.$$

2. Summary Average Raw Score. This consists of the mean of the four Average Raw Scores for each officer:

$$\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d} = (\bar{X}_a + \bar{X}_b + \bar{X}_c + \bar{X}_d) / 4.$$

3. Average Standard Score. In order to obtain a measure in which the influence of report number, rater familiarity, and type of duty station have been statistically removed, standard scores were computed as follows. All fitness reports analyzed in this study were grouped so that within each group the fitness reports were identical with respect to report number, rater familiarity, and type of duty station. Within each of these groups the raw scores were then converted to standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10: Z_a, Z_b, Z_c, Z_d .

The average of the standard scores for each of the four ratings analyzed in this study was computed for each officer: $\bar{Z}_a, \bar{Z}_b, \bar{Z}_c, \bar{Z}_d$. The number of reports on which the average was based ranged from 1 to 5.

4. Summary Average Standard Score. This consists of the mean of the four Average Standard Scores for each officer:

$$\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d} = (\bar{Z}_a + \bar{Z}_b + \bar{Z}_c + \bar{Z}_d) / 4.$$

Means were computed for fitness report marks associated with each of the "Type of Duty Station" categories, significance tests were applied to differences between means, and correlations were computed between the various scores.

E. RESULTS

1. Means

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the mean raw scores of the population categorized in various ways.

As indicated by the means in Table 1, the fitness report marks were skewed toward the positive end of each rating scale (the positive end of the scale was coded 0, and the negative end of the scale was coded 10). This is consistent with the frequently reported skewness of military performance ratings.

Table 1 also shows that there is more variance (reflected by the standard deviations) associated with the "Desirability" scale than with the other scales. The mean fitness scores obtained while on "U.S. Shore Duty," were more favorable (numerically lower) than the corresponding mean scores of other stations. With one exception, the mean scores for "Small Combat Vessel" were less favorable (numerically higher) than the corresponding mean scores of other stations.

Table 2 shows the results of significance tests applied to the differences among the means shown in Table 1. "Shore Duty in U.S." is significantly better than the other types of duty station. The only other significant difference found was between "Large Combat Vessel" and "Small Combat Vessel," ratings from the former being more favorable (lower numerically).

Table 3 presents the ratings on "Present Assignment" categorized in terms of the situational variable being investigated. The previously noted tendency for first fitness scores given at "U.S. Shore Duty" and on "Small Combat Vessel" to be better and poorer, respectively, than reports given at other stations is herein shown² to also hold for later fitness reports. A general tendency for mean fitness scores to improve

²Columns \bar{X}_D and \bar{X}_B compared to Columns \bar{X}_A and \bar{X}_C and \bar{X}_E .

TABLE 1

Rating Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Groups
By Type of Duty Station on First Fitness Report

Type of Duty Station	Rating a (Present Assignment)			Rating b (Desirability)			Rating c (Comparability)			Rating d (Qualities)		
	<u>N</u>	\bar{X}_a	SD	<u>N</u>	\bar{X}_b	SD	<u>N</u>	\bar{X}_c	SD	<u>N</u>	\bar{X}_d	SD
A. Large Combat Vessel	348	2.82	1.39	348	2.57	1.72	348	3.05	1.45	335	3.10	1.24
B. Small Combat Vessel	365	3.09	1.41	366	2.90	1.67	366	3.33	1.36	354	3.28	1.17
C. Non-Combat Vessel	42	2.88	1.21	42	2.57	1.55	42	3.19	1.17	40	3.03	1.10
D. Shore Duty in U.S.	225	2.41	1.14	225	2.18	1.42	221	2.65	1.08	215	2.60	1.04
E. Shore Duty outside U.S.	33	2.94	1.14	33	2.91	1.51	33	3.15	1.23	32	3.06	1.05

TABLE 2

Significance Levels of Differences Between Duty Stations
In Mean Ratings on First Fitness Report
(t-tests)

Duty Station	Rating a (Present Assignment)				Rating b (Desirability)				Rating c (Comparability)				Rating d (Qualities)			
	B	C	D	E	B	C	D	E	B	C	D	E	B	C	D	E
A. Large Combat Vessel	.02	NS	.005	NS	.01	NS	.005	NS	.01	NS	.005	NS	.10	NS	.005	NS
B. Small Combat Vessel	(-)	NS	.005	NS	(-)	NS	.005	NS	(-)	NS	.005	NS	(-)	NS	.005	NS
C. Non-Combat Vessel		(-)	.05	NS		(-)	NS	NS		(-)	.01	NS		(-)	.05	NS
D. Shore Duty in U.S.			(-)	.02			(-)	.01			(-)	.05			(-)	.05
E. Shore Duty outside U.S.				(-)				(-)				(-)				(-)

Note.--

NS = not significant

TABLE 3

Fitness Scale "a" (Present Assignment) Means, Standard Deviations, and N's for Groups
By Report Number, Duty Station, and Number of Reports by Same Rater

Fitness Report Number*	Report By Same Rater**	A. Large Combat Vessel			B. Small Combat Vessel			C. Non-Combat Vessel			D. Shore Duty in U. S.			E. Shore Duty outside U.S.		
		\bar{X}_A	SD	N	\bar{X}_B	SD	N	\bar{X}_C	SD	N	\bar{X}_D	SD	N	\bar{X}_E	SD	N
I	1	2.82	1.39	348	3.09	1.41	365	2.88	1.21	42	2.41	1.14	225	2.94	1.14	33
II	1	2.51	1.51	201	2.71	1.49	176	2.44	1.30	62	2.28	1.31	101	2.25	1.37	20
	2	2.67	1.49	193	2.66	1.51	234	2.74	1.21	23	1.84	1.14	152	2.19	.85	26
III	1	2.44	1.57	159	2.62	1.82	107	2.03	1.55	33	2.01	1.17	80	1.71	1.15	21
	2	2.26	1.40	164	2.38	1.57	140	1.87	1.22	39	1.90	1.68	51	1.71	1.14	14
	3	2.39	1.39	51	2.55	1.50	143	2.75	.87	12	1.56	1.26	96	1.43	.98	7
IV	1	1.87	1.42	113	2.30	1.62	100	2.28	1.55	32	2.07	1.50	68	1.50	1.73	4
	2	2.15	1.43	87	2.30	1.78	57	2.27	1.91	15	1.69	1.20	29	2.00	.89	6
	3	2.39	1.76	71	2.11	1.85	66	1.80	1.79	5	1.62	1.32	21	1.50	1.29	4
	4	2.20	1.30	5	2.41	1.56	34	2.00	0.00	1	.83	.72	12			0
V	1	2.05	1.53	64	1.82	1.28	28	1.71	1.25	7	2.16	1.13	31	2.50	2.13	2
	2	1.79	1.50	28	2.25	1.96	24	1.40	1.14	5	3.71	2.93	7			0
	3	1.60	1.38	30	1.33	1.03	6	2.33	1.53	3	3.00	0.00	1	2.00	0.00	1
	4			0	2.25	1.36	12			0	1.33	.58	3	3.00	0.00	1
	5			0	3.00	0.00	1			0			0			0

Note.--

* This column indicates the sequential number of the fitness report on the officers, i.e., "III" indicates the 3rd report on the officers.

** This column indicates the number of reports on an officer completed by the same rater, i.e., of the total number of III reports received, "1" indicates that the 3rd report was the first one submitted on the officer by the particular rater, a "2" indicates that it was the 2nd submitted on the officer by the particular rater, and a "3" indicates that it was 3rd -- which means that all three of his ratings came from the same rater.

with each subsequent report³ is evident, but no trend associated with rater familiarity⁴ is evident from a visual inspection of Table 3.

2. Intercorrelations

Table 4 presents the intercorrelations between the various raw and standardized scores for both the first report and averages based on all reports.

F. DISCUSSION

1. Station Differences

The results of this analysis show a distinct difference in the fitness marks received by officers assigned to various types of stations. If the assumption is made that there was no selective detailing on the basis of ability (i.e., no discrimination on ability was used by detailing officers in assigning these officers to the types of billets herein analyzed), then to treat fitness marks from some types of duty stations (like Small Combat Vessel) as equivalent to fitness marks from other types (like Shore Station, U.S.) is, in effect, penalizing the officers at the former stations and unduly rewarding officers at the latter stations.

If some type of selective detailing is operating, the equivalence of ratings given at various types of duty stations depends on the direction of the selective detailing. If there is a tendency to assign officers with greater general ability to U.S. Shore Stations, and to assign officers with less general ability to Small Combat Ships, then the fitness marks received may truly be equivalent. On the other hand, should the detailing be in the opposite direction, the fitness marks would have even more inequality than Table 1 indicates. As will be noted in later discussions, this problem of differences between duty stations in fitness reports is less serious than it seems.

³Numerically the means in Row I > the means in Row II > the means in Row III, etc.

⁴For example there is no trend shown in Column \bar{X}_B on the IVth report that corresponds to the increased rater exposure, i.e., \bar{X} is 2.30 for raters who for the first time rated the officer, \bar{X} is 2.30 for 2nd reports by the same rater, 2.11 for 3rd reports by the same rater and 2.41 for 4th reports by the same rater.

TABLE 4

Intercorrelations of Raw and Standardized Fitness Report Scores

RAW SCORES										STANDARDIZED SCORES									
FIRST REPORT					ALL REPORTS					FIRST REPORT					ALL REPORTS				
X_a	X_b	X_c	X_d	$\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d}$	X_a	X_b	X_c	X_d	$\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d}$	Z_a	Z_b	Z_c	Z_d	$\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d}$	Z_a	Z_b	Z_c	Z_d	$\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d}$
X_a	80	78	84	91	75	63	67	70	73	98	78	75	81	88	75	66	67	69	73
X_b		82	79	91	64	69	66	65	71	78	98	79	77	89	65	76	67	65	72
X_c			75	89	62	62	72	63	69	75	79	98	73	86	62	66	75	62	69
X_d				89	70	64	67	79	74	81	76	72	98	86	70	68	67	78	74
$\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d}$ (1st Rep. Average Raw Score)					73	71	73	75	78	89	89	87	86	93	74	75	74	74	77
\bar{X}_a						87	88	91	96	72	61	58	67	69	97	84	84	88	93
\bar{X}_b							90	86	96	60	67	59	61	66	85	97	87	84	93
\bar{X}_c								86	95	63	63	69	64	69	85	87	97	83	92
\bar{X}_d									95	67	62	59	75	70	88	85	83	97	92
$\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d}$ (Summary Average Raw Score)										70	69	66	71	73	93	93	92	92	97
Z_a											79	76	83	90	76	67	68	70	73
Z_b												80	78	90	65	77	68	65	72
Z_c													74	88	63	66	76	63	70
Z_d														88	71	69	68	80	75
$\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d}$ (1st Rep. Average Standard Score)															73	75	74	74	77
\bar{Z}_a																87	87	91	96
\bar{Z}_b																	89	87	95
\bar{Z}_c																		85	95
\bar{Z}_d																			95
$\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d}$ (Summary Average Standard Score)																			

RATING CODE:

Note.--

Decimal point omitted.

N ranges from 889 to 1261

- a Present assignment
- b Desirability in time of war
- c Comparison with other officers
- d Personal qualities
- e Combined traits

2. Rater Familiarity

These were non-existent or negligible in this analysis. That is, successive reports by the same rater did not show an increment over time beyond that accounted for by the report number. (See Table 3 and discussion.)

3. Rating Number

The general trend of more favorable ratings with later fitness reports⁵, though statistically significant, does not markedly influence the relative ranks of the officers rated. (See Section 5, below.)

It is interesting to note that the "higher rating over time" phenomenon takes place even though it would not theoretically occur if the directions for marking fitness reports were rigidly followed. Fitness marks are to be based on a comparison with other officers of the same rank⁶ and length of service. Since in each case the marking is to be made relative to other officers of equal rank and length of service even if all officers improved to the same extent (in an absolute sense) over time, the distribution of marks assigned would theoretically stay at the same level⁷.

4. Use of a Single Summary Score to Reflect an Officer's Cumulated Fitness Marks

Justification for combining ratings must consider the amount of variance that will be masked by the combining process. The more highly correlated the ratings the smaller will be the amount of information lost in the combining process and vice versa. Table 4 shows, underlined in the second diagonal subsection, the intercorrelations between average raw scores across all reports. They range from .86 to .91. Rimland (1959) has demonstrated stability in fitness marks after the accumulation of 4-5 fitness reports. The average raw scores in the present study are based upon approximately 4-5 fitness reports. The lowest average raw score intercorrelation is .86 (across all reports) which means that in this lowest relationship some variance would be lost in combining the average raw scores. In the remaining cases less variance would be lost.

⁵As seen in Tables 1 and 3, a general tendency for mean fitness scores to improve with each subsequent report.

⁶All the officers in this sample were ensigns during the entire period studied.

⁷It has been substantiated that fitness marks tend to be more favorable with higher rank, so in actuality the instructions are not being rigidly followed.

The Summary Average Raw Score is a single score for each officer. If it is closely related to the Average Raw Scores representing each rating then this Summary Average Raw Score may serve to represent the cumulative fitness marks of officers across all scales. As seen in the tenth column in the table the four average raw scores for each rating are correlated .96, .96, .95, and .95 respectively with the Summary Average Raw Score. The Summary Average Raw Score thus represents the four average raw scores fairly well (only 10% of the variance is lost) and they in turn represent the cumulative fitness marks received.

5. Standardization of Scores

Standardizing scores, in the manner previously described, statistically removes differences in marking characteristics between stations, between report numbers, and between degrees of rater familiarity. If a Summary Average Standard Score based on these standard scores differed greatly from the corresponding Summary Average Raw Score, it would indicate that these (extraneous) situational variables (singly and/or interactionally) cumulatively are strongly influencing the fitness marks. If, on the other hand, there is a close relationship between the raw and standardized Summary Average Scores, the combined influence of these situational variables has little influence on the fitness marks. The correlation between the two scores ($\bar{X}_{a \rightarrow d}$ & $\bar{Z}_{a \rightarrow d}$) can be seen to be .97 from Table 4 (last column, tenth row). This indicates that the latter alternative is the actual one. Since the raw and the standardized (corrected) Summary Scores are essentially equivalent, the more simply attained raw Summary Score is the more feasible of the two to use as a unitary score of over-all effectiveness.

G. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There are differences in average fitness assigned ratings of various types of duty stations, but these are relatively small in comparison with the large individual differences found among officers in the ratings received.
2. Fitness marks assigned to ensigns tend to move toward more favorable scores on succeeding reports.
3. Statistical corrections for type of duty station, rater familiarity, and report number need not be made in producing a criterion for research purposes, since the effects of these corrections are negligible.

4. The Summary Average Raw Score is a feasible unitary score for use as a research criterion of officer performance.

REFERENCES

Rimland, B. An analysis of officer fitness report summaries.
Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1959. (Technical
Bulletin 59-18)

APPENDIX A

WORKSHEET

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

NAVPERS-310-W (REV. 2-84)

THE OFFICER REPORTED ON WILL FILL IN THE FIRST ELEVEN SECTIONS:

1. NAME (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	2. GRADE	3. USN (R)	4. DESIGNATOR	5. FILE NO.
6. SHIP OR STATION A. Large Combat Vessel B. Small Combat Vessel C. Non-Cmbt Vessel D. Shore Dty US E. Shore Dty Outside US F. Duty Under Instruction			7. DATE REPORTED PRESENT DUTY STATION			

8. OCCASION FOR REPORT SEMI-ANNUAL <input type="checkbox"/> DETACHMENT OF REPORTING SENIOR <input type="checkbox"/> DETACHMENT OF OFFICER <input type="checkbox"/>	9. TYPE OF REPORT REGULAR <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL <input type="checkbox"/>	10. PERIOD OF REPORT FROM TO
---	--	---------------------------------

11. DUTIES. List principal duties assigned including watches, and indicate in parentheses after each the number of months during the reporting period. If assignment is in other than regular Navy billet or involves duties not well established, give outline of purpose, scope, and significance of such duties. If necessary, use separate sheet and attach to this form.

FOLLOWING TO BE FILLED IN BY THE REPORTING OFFICER:

Signature of officer reported on:

12. EMPLOYMENT OF COMMAND DURING PERIOD OF THIS REPORT

13. REFERENCE HERE AND APPEND ANY COMMENDABLE OR ADVERSE REPORTS ON THIS OFFICER RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD OF THIS REPORT

14. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES (In comparison with other officers of his grade and approximate length of service, consider the requirements of his duties and evaluate his performance.)

DUTY ASSIGNMENT		NOT OBSERVED		Outstanding performance in most aspects of his duty assignments. Highly qualified.		Excellent performance in most aspects of his duty assignments. Efficient or competent in most of the remaining aspects. Frequently demonstrates outstanding performance.		Competent and efficient performance in most aspects of his duty assignments. Frequently demonstrates excellent performance.		Satisfactory performance in most aspects of his duty assignments. Needs some supervision. Basically qualified.		Inadequate performance in many aspects of his duty assignments. Needs close supervision. He is not qualified. (Adverse)	
14	(a) Present Assignment		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	6		10	
	(b) As _____ Watch Officer												
	(c) Collateral Duties _____												
	(d) Technical Specialty _____												
	(e) Ship Handling												
	(f) In Administration												
	(g) Ability to Command												
	(h) As Executive or Division Officer												
	(i) Duty on a Staff												
	(j) Other _____												

15. Considering the possible requirements of war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command. Would you:

Particularly desire to have him? ☐ Prefer him to most? ☐ Be pleased to have him? ☐ Be satisfied to have him? ☐ Prefer not to have him? (Adverse) ☐

16. (a) In comparison with other officers of his grade and approximate length of service, how would you designate this officer?
(b) For this report period indicate in (b) how many officers of his grade you have designated in each category of (a).

	One of the few highly outstanding officers I know	A very fine officer of great value to the service	A dependable and typically effective officer	An acceptable officer	Unsatisfactory (Adverse)
(a)					
(b)					

17. COMMENTS. In this section it is important that the outstanding characteristics of the officer, and any weaknesses which seriously affect his performance of duty, be reported. The appraisal should be concise and concrete in terms of specific examples of performance from which the more general factors can be inferred. The appraisal will justify the marks assigned in items 14, 15, and 16, above. In addition, the appraisal should include outstanding qualifications in any field such as the following: administration, planning, logistics, electronics, new weapons, and in dealing with the public in personal or official contacts. This space must not be left blank.

18. NAME, GRADE, AND FILE NUMBER OF REPORTING OFFICER. OFFICIAL STATUS RELATIVE TO OFFICER REPORTED ON.

Code used to designate reporting seniors: ENS (1) LTJG (2) LT (3) LCDR (4) CDR (5) CAPT (6)

19. In comparison with other officers of his grade and approximate length of service or approximate length of duty assignment, to what degree has this officer exhibited the following qualities?

(a) PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE (Consider the requirements of his various duty assignments and compare them to his professional knowledge.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Has exceptional knowledge of his duty assignments. Extremely well informed.	Has excellent knowledge of most phases of his duty assignments. Is well informed on the remaining phases. Occasionally demonstrates exceptional knowledge.	Is well informed on most phases of his duty assignments. Frequently demonstrates excellent knowledge.	Has satisfactory knowledge of routine phases of his duty assignments.	Serious gaps in his knowledge of fundamentals of his duty assignments. (Adverse)
	* 0 1	2 3	4 5	6 8	* 10

(b) COOPERATION (Consider ability and willingness to work in harmony with and for others.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Extremely successful in working with others. Has an outstanding ability to create harmony.	Promotes harmony in dealing with others. A very good team worker.	Gets along well with most people. Knows how to take orders. Fits in with a team.	Indifferent to others. Cooperates occasionally.	Inclined to create friction. Generally not cooperative. (Adverse)
	* 0 1	2 3	4 5	6 8	* 10

(c) JUDGMENT (Consider his ability to grasp a situation, think clearly, and develop correct and logical conclusions.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Outstandingly sound and logical thinker with an exceptional grasp of the situation involved.	Exceptionally good judgment based on sound evaluation of all the factors involved.	Judgment is usually sound and reasonable.	Is prone to neglect or misinterpret facts. Occasionally commits errors in judgment.	Due to faulty judgment, his decisions or recommendations are too frequently wrong. (Adverse)
	* 0 1	2 3	4 5	6 8	* 10

(d) LEADERSHIP (Consider his ability in organizing, obtaining the cooperation of others, and in directing their efforts effectively.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Outstanding skill in directing others results in a very effective unit. Inspires confidence even under very difficult circumstances.	A consistently good leader. Commands respect of his subordinates. Is very effective under difficult circumstances.	Capable leader. Develops good cooperation and team work in difficult circumstances. Knows how to give orders.	Generally obtains effective cooperation under normal circumstances.	Fails to command. Unable to exert control. (Adverse)
	* 0 1	2 3	4 5	6 8	* 10

(e) PROMOTION POTENTIAL (Consider his capacity to handle jobs of increased scope and greater responsibility, ability to learn rapidly, personality, self-improvement efforts, special abilities, and training.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Capable of increased responsibility and rapid advancement.	Very promising promotional material.	Demonstrates promise for further growth at moderate rate.	Present job is taxing his capabilities. Requires considerable amount of training.	Definitely limited. (Adverse)
	* 0 1	2 3	4 5	6 8	* 10

(f) MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS (Consider his utilization of men, money, and materials.)

NOT OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/>	Is most effective in the utilization of men, money, and materials.	Is effective in accomplishing extra savings in men, money, and materials by implementing and maintaining improved management procedures.	Conserves men, money, and materials effectively by implementing and maintaining routine management procedures.	Utilizes men, money, and materials in a barely satisfactory manner.	Is needlessly wasteful of men, money, and materials. Is irresponsible in this regard. (Adverse)

(g) REMARKS. Marks in any of the starred (*) boxes must be justified in this section with a brief description of the factors which were considered in evaluating the officer. The justification should be in concrete and specific terms.

20. State your estimate of this officer's capacity for original and constructive professional work and indicate to what degree his performance during this reporting period has reflected that capacity. State concrete attainments wherever possible. If not observed, so state.

21. (a) As a general rule, officers should not be shown their fitness reports by the reporting seniors unless the report contains adverse matter. An adverse report must be referred for statement pursuant to Article 1701-(8) Navy Regulations. His statement should be attached to this report.

(b) Has the officer reported on seen this report? YES ☐ NO ☐

22. DATE FORWARDED _____

23. _____

(Signature of reporting officer)

24. _____

(Signature of regular reporting senior if report is concurrent)

WORKSHEET

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D		
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) U. S. Naval Personnel Research Activity San Diego, California 92152		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
		2b. GROUP
3. REPORT TITLE THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTING EARLY FITNESS REPORTS FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Interim		
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Githens, William H., Rimland, Bernard, Steinemann, John H.		
6. REPORT DATE October 1965	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 18	7b. NO. OF REFS 1
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Research Report SRR 66-7	
b. PROJECT NO. PF016060101		
c.	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
d.		
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Distribution of this document is unlimited		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-A3) Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20370	
13. ABSTRACT <p>The major purpose of this investigation was to determine the need for making statistical corrections to the fitness reports of junior officers to adjust for possible inequalities due to extraneous situational factors. The situational influences for which corrections were made were (a) type of duty stations at which reports were made, (b) number of reports (up to 5), the officer had received, (c) rater familiarity with the junior officer, as measured by the number of successive reports completed by the same rater.</p> <p>The analysis was conducted on the reports received during the first 18 months of active duty of 1,338 members of the NROTC graduating Class of 1959. The sample was fractionated into groups homogeneous with regard to the variables being studied. Standard scores were computed for each subgroup, and these were compared with raw, unstandardized average fitness scores for the total group.</p> <p>Although conducted in the process of developing a means of using early fitness reports as a research criterion, the findings of this study were encouraging in that they suggest the fitness report to be relatively uninfluenced by extraneous factors as used operationally.</p>		

DD FORM 1473

1 JAN 64

0101-807-6800

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

14	KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
		ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Research Report (SRR)

Personnel Measurement Research Department

Commandant
U.S. Marine Corps
(Code AO1B)
Washington, D.C. 20380

Commandant
U.S. Marine Corps
(Code AA)
Washington, D.C. 20380

Commanding Officer and Director
U.S. Naval Training Device Center
Port Washington, New York 11080

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations
(OP-07116)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20350

Commanding Officer
Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center
San Diego, California 92147

Commanding Officer
Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School
San Diego, California 92147

Commanding Officer
Fleet Training Center
U.S. Naval Station
San Diego, California 92136

Human Factors Operations Research
Laboratory
Air Force Systems Command
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, D.C. 20332

Management School
U.S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

Marine Corps Institute
(Attn: Evaluation Unit)
Washington, D.C.

Chief of Naval Air Technical Training
U.S. Naval Air Station
(ATTN: Code 75)
Memphis, Tennessee 38115

Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training
Box 1
U.S. Naval Air Station
Glenview, Illinois 60026

Chief of Naval Air Training
U.S. Naval Air Station
Pensacola, Florida 32508

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Examining Center
Bldg. 2711
U.S. Naval Training Center
Great Lakes, Illinois 60088

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Receiving Station
Treasure Island
San Francisco, California 94130

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Receiving Station
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine
U.S. Naval Aviation Medical Center
Pensacola, Florida 32512

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Submarine Medical Center
U.S. Naval Submarine Base, New London
Groton, Connecticut 06342

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Medical Research Institute
NMMC
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Director
U.S. Naval Personnel Research Laboratory
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20390 (3 copies)

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Schools Command
U.S. Naval Base
Newport, Rhode Island 02844

Officer in Charge
U.S. Naval Submarine School
Box 700, U.S. Naval Submarine Base
New London, Groton, Connecticut 06342

Commander
U.S. Naval Training Center
Great Lakes, Illinois 60088

Commanding Officer and Director
U.S. Naval Training Devices Center
(Library)
Port Washington, New York 11050

Officer in Charge
U.S. Navy Medical Neuropsychiatric
Research Unit
San Diego, California 92152

Commanding Officer
Nuclear Weapons Training Center,
Pacific
U.S. Naval Air Station, North Island
San Diego, California

Operations Analysis Section
Headquarters SAC
Offutt Air Force Base
Omaha, Nebraska

Commander
Pacific Missile Range
Point Mugu, California 93041

Psychiatry & Neurology Consultant
Office of Army Surgeon General
Washington, D.C.

Scientific Director
U.S. Naval Submarine Medical Center
U.S. Naval Submarine Base
New London, Groton, Connecticut 06342

Commanding Officer
Service School Command
U.S. Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133

Commanding Officer
Service School Command, Bldg. 300
U.S. Naval Training Center
Great Lakes, Illinois 60088

Superintendent
U.S. Coast Guard Academy
New London, Connecticut

Superintendent
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland 21402

Superintendent
U.S. Naval Postgraduate School
(Library)
Monterey, California 93940

Commandant
U.S. Coast Guard (Code PTP)
Washington, D. C.

6570 AMRL (MRP)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

U.S. Army Adjutant General's School
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana

U. S. Army Infantry
HRU
Fort Benning, Georgia

U.S. Army Personnel Research Office
Office, Chief Research and Development
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20315

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

Chief, Bureau of Ships
(Attn: Code 364C)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20360

Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C.

Chief, Bureau of Medicine & Surgery
(Code 513)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20390

Chief, Bureau of Medicine & Surgery
(Code 33)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20390

Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20390

Chief of Naval Operations
(OP-91)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20350

Commanding Officer
Air Force Personnel Laboratory
(ASD - AFSC)
Lackland Air Force Base
San Antonio, Texas 78558

Commander
Personnel Research Laboratory
Aerospace Medical Division
Air Force Systems Command
Lackland Air Force Base
San Antonio, Texas 78200

U.S. Army Leadership Training Center
(HRU)
Presidio of Monterey, California

Commanding Officer and Director
U.S. Navy Electronics Laboratory
San Diego, California 92152

Chief of Naval Personnel
(Pers-A3)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20370 (15 copies)

Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (20 copies)

Commandant, FIRST Naval District
495 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Commandant, THIRD Naval District
90 Church Street
New York, New York 10007

Commandant, FOURTH Naval District
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112

Commandant, FIFTH Naval District
Norfolk, Virginia 23511

Commandant, SIXTH Naval District
U.S. Naval Base
Charleston, South Carolina 29408

Commandant, EIGHTH Naval District
New Orleans, Louisiana 70140

Commandant, NINTH Naval District
Building 1
Great Lakes, Illinois 60088

Commandant, TENTH Naval District
Navy #116
%Fleet Post Office
New York, New York 09592

Commandant, ELEVENTH Naval District
San Diego, California 92130

Commandant, TWELFTH Naval District
Federal Office Bldg.
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Commandant, THIRTEENTH Naval District
Seattle, Washington 98115

Commandant, FOURTEENTH Naval District
Box 110
Navy #128
%Fleet Post Office
San Francisco, California 96614

Commandant, FIFTEENTH Naval District
Navy #121
%Fleet Post Office
New York, New York 09589

Commandant, SEVENTEENTH Naval District
Navy #127
%Postmaster
Seattle, Washington 98790

Commandant
Naval District Washington D.C.
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20390

Commander
Fleet Training Group, Code 51
%FPO San Francisco, Calif. 96610
Attn: Training Officer

UNCLASSIFIED ONLY

Dr. Robert Glaser
American Institute for Research
Department of Psychology
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15200

Dunlap and Associates, Inc.
Darien, Connecticut 06821

Human Factors Research, Inc.
3040 State Street
Santa Barbara, California 93105

Human Resources Research Office
Aviation Detachment
Fort Rucker, Alabama

Human Factors Test Officer
Air Force Systems Command
Los Angeles, California

National Library of Medicine
Washington, D.C.

National Research Council
Division of Anthropology & Psychology
Washington, D.C.

National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C.

Personnel Administration Department
Proctor & Gamble Company
(Attn: Dr. W. Mollenkopf)
Cincinnati, Ohio

Personnel Planning and Research
Raytheon Company
(Attn: Dr. H. R. Brenner)
Lexington, Massachusetts

The Rand Corporation
(Library)
Santa Monica, California

Science Research Associates, Inc.
259 East Erie Street
Chicago, Illinois 60600

American Institute for Research
Project Talent Office
1808 Adams Mill Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20000

American Institute for Research
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15200

Applied Psychology Corp.
3717 North 27th Street
Arlington, Virginia

Applied Psychological Services
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Dr. S. Rains Wallace
Chief Behavioral and Social
Science Division
Office of the Assistant Director
Department of Defense
Washington, D.C. 20000

Mr. Paul Brown
Office of the Chief of Naval
Operations (OP-01B1)
Room 4E487, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20350

Chief of Naval Operations
(OP-03EG)
Navy Department
Washington, D.C. 20350

Dr. Joseph W. Rigney
Department of Psychology
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California

Directorate of Personnel Research
and Selection
Room 3003 "B" Building
Canadian Forces Headquarters
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada